

SINGULARITIES IN SILENT UNIVERSES: STATE OF THE ART

MARCO BRUNI

*ICTP, International Center for Theoretical Physics, P. O. Box 586, 34014 Trieste, Italy
SISSA, via Beirut 2-4, 34013 Trieste, Italy*

HENK VAN ELST

*Astronomy Unit, Queen Mary & Westfield College,
University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK*

CLAES UGGLA

*Department of Physics, Stockholm University, Box 6730, S-113 85 Stockholm, Sweden
and
Department of Physics, Luleå University of Technology, S-951 87 Luleå, Sweden*

ABSTRACT

After a brief overview of the so-called silent models and their present status, we consider the subclass of Bianchi Type-I models with a magnetic field source. Due to the presence of the magnetic field, the initial singularity shows “oscillatory” features reminiscent of the Bianchi Type-IX case. The Bianchi Type-I models with a magnetic field are therefore a counterexample to the folklore that matter fields can be neglected in the vicinity of the singularity.

*Proceedings of the
12th Italian Conference on General Relativity and Gravitational Physics*

IC/96/223
SISSA-160/96/A

1. Introduction

Often a preferred timelike vector field u^a exists in a cosmological context (usually the 4-velocity of the fluid), and various kinematical and dynamical quantities are defined with respect to u^a : for example, the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor C^a_{bcd} are, respectively, $E^a_b := C^a_{cbd} u^c u^d$ and $H^a_b := \frac{1}{2} \eta^a_{ce} C^e_{fbd} u^c u^d$. The so-called “silent universes” are cosmological models characterized by two specific features: the first regards their matter content, which is taken to be a perfect fluid with vanishing pressure, $p = 0$; the second regards the dynamics, constrained by assuming the vanishing of the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor, $H_{ab} = 0$. The name “silent” itself comes from noticing that the assumptions $p = H_{ab} = 0$ imply the lack of sound and gravitational waves.¹ In the recent cosmological literature, models characterized by $p = H_{ab} = 0$ plus a third assumption, the vanishing of the vorticity of the fluid $\omega_{ab} = 0$, were originally introduced by Matarrese *et al* (1993) to model the non-linear evolution of perturbations during the matter dominated era.² It was hoped that these models could give a reasonably good description of the growth of structure in a collisionless medium. The assumptions $p = \omega_{ab} = 0$ are very standard in dealing with these problems; the restriction $H_{ab} = 0$ was introduced by extrapolating from the vanishing of H_{ab} in first-order scalar perturbations.³ Matarrese *et al* (1993) also implicitly assumed² that the field equations were compatible with the $H_{ab} = 0$ constraint or, in other words, that the evolution of initial data preserves $H_{ab} = 0$. This assumption was corroborated by a preceding paper by Barnes and Rowlingson⁴ (1989), and later on by work⁵ of Lesame *et al* (1995).

In studying models with $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$ one takes the matter density μ , the expansion scalar Θ , the shear σ_{ab} and the electric Weyl tensor E_{ab} as physical variables; the dynamics of these quantities is then determined by a set of field equations arising from the Ricci and the Bianchi identities*. The amazing feature of these models is that the evolution equations for the variables μ , Θ , σ_{ab} , E_{ab} become a set of quasi-linear first-order ordinary differential equations (ODEs), as was first explicitly shown² by Matarrese *et al* (1993). This fact itself was enough to raise the attention of cosmologists on these silent models:⁶ would they provide a fair description of the non-linear evolution of cosmological perturbations? The assumptions $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$ would simplify computer simulations of large-scale structure formation enormously. Unfortunately, it was soon realized by Matarrese *et al*¹ (1994) that the $H_{ab} = 0$ assumption already breaks down at the second order in the perturbations. In this context it should be noted that the cosmological effects of H_{ab} have never been properly quantified. Assuming that the constraint $H_{ab} = 0$ was compatible with the evolution equations for the physical variables, the dynamics of silent models with $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$ was investigated from a dynamical system point of view by Bruni *et al* (1995), who focused on the character of the singularities.⁷ They found that the generic final fate of a fluid element under the $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$ restrictions is to fall into a spindle-like

*In this approach, the Einstein equations are used to establish an algebraic constraint between the Ricci part of the curvature, and the energy-momentum tensor.

Kasner singularity, while only a set of measure zero of initial data leads to a pancake (which is instead thought to be generic in a Newtonian collapse scenario). Finally, in a parallel work, Bruni *et al* (1995) included a cosmological constant Λ in their analysis⁸ in order to investigate the so-called “cosmic no-hair” conjecture,⁹ and it was indeed found that the de Sitter spacetime is the unique attractor for initial data leading to expansion[†]. An important class of spatially inhomogeneous exact solutions resides in the silent family, namely the well-known Szekeres models.¹⁰ These contain the spherically symmetric Lemaître–Tolman–Bondi models which in turn have the spatially homogeneous Kantowski–Sachs models as a special subclass. The Szekeres models are of Petrov type D, and may be called degenerate, in that the Weyl tensor (reducing to its electric part E_{ab}) and the shear σ_{ab} each have two equal eigenvalues. Recently the existence of a more general spatially inhomogeneous class of silent models (of non-degenerate Petrov type I) has been challenged.^{11,12} Furthermore, even if these models exist, their singularities are unstable against H_{ab} perturbations,¹³ and their relevance to structure formation is at least doubtful.¹ Therefore, in the following we shall focus on homogeneous spatially flat silent models of Bianchi Type–I with a magnetic field, which do exist as solutions of the Einstein–Maxwell field equations.

2. Dynamics of spatially flat silent universes with a magnetic field

As we said above, the evolution equations one obtains under the assumptions $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$ are ODEs. Then, it is natural to ask if these restrictions can be relaxed, or if other matter fields can be considered, such that the ODE-structure of the evolution equations is retained. We have found that this is indeed the case if one has non-vanishing fluid vorticity $\omega_{ab} \neq 0$, or if one includes a magnetic field H_a as an additional matter source. In the latter case also the Maxwell equations come into play. When $p = \omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = H_a = 0$, the shear σ_{ab} and the electric Weyl tensor E_{ab} admit a common Fermi–Walker transported eigentetrad.^{4,2} This is also true if a magnetic field is aligned with one of the shear eigendirections. However, for non-zero fluid vorticity ω_{ab} or a general magnetic field H_a , the eigentetrads of the shear and the electric Weyl tensor are no longer Fermi–Walker transported, nor do they coincide.

One can show that non-shear-aligned magnetic fields are only compatible with a spatially homogeneous Bianchi Type–I spacetime geometry,¹⁴ which we will consider in the following. The kinematical quantities we use refer to the normal timelike congruence associated with the spacelike surfaces of homogeneity. For simplicity we take the energy-momentum tensor to be comprised of the magnetic field H_a only.[‡] The Bianchi Type–I spacetime geometry automatically implies $\omega_{ab} = H_{ab} = 0$. Here, we

[†]It was also found⁸ that there are also initial data for which, even after a period of inflation, a recollapse occurs, in which case Λ is soon negligible, and the collapse leads to a Kasner spindle-like singularity, as in the $\Lambda = 0$ case. On the other hand, when $\Lambda = 0$, the attractor for initial data leading to expansion is the Milne model.⁷

[‡]A dust matter field with $p_D = 0$ and/or a cosmological Λ can always be added, and indeed their coming into play makes the discussion of the corresponding models more interesting for physical purposes, but for the sake of simplicity we shall not consider them here.

adopt a tetrad description, where we denote the spatial components of tensor fields by Greek indices, and we choose a shear eigentetrad. From a dynamical point of view, the configuration outlined is completely characterized by two of the shear eigenvalues, e.g., σ_2 and σ_3 , the expansion scalar Θ , and the three magnetic field component H_α . However, in order to study their dynamical properties, it is very useful to introduce five dimensionless variables, a dimensionless angular velocity (Fermi-rotation), and a new time derivative:

$$\Sigma_\pm := \sigma_\pm/\Theta, \quad \mathcal{H}_\alpha := \sqrt{3}H_\alpha/\Theta, \quad R_\alpha := \Omega_\alpha/\Theta, \quad \partial_0 := 3\mathbf{e}_0/\Theta, \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_+ := 3(\sigma_2 + \sigma_3)/2$ and $\sigma_- := \sqrt{3}(\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)/2$, Ω_α gives the angular velocity of the spatial tetrad with respect to a Fermi-transported basis, and $\mathbf{e}_0$ denotes the time derivative along u^a . Finally, it is also useful to define the standard deceleration parameter $q := -3\dot{\Theta}/\Theta^2 - 1$ and a density parameter $\Omega_H := \mathcal{H}_\alpha \mathcal{H}^\alpha/2$, related to the shear variables $\Sigma_\pm$ by

$$q = 1 + \Sigma_+^2 + \Sigma_-^2; \quad \Omega_H = 1 - \Sigma_+^2 - \Sigma_-^2. \quad (2)$$

With these definitions, we obtain the following evolution equations:

$$\partial_0 \Sigma_+ = -(2 - q) \Sigma_+ + \mathcal{H}_1^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{H}_2^2 + \mathcal{H}_3^2), \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_0 \Sigma_- = -(2 - q) \Sigma_- - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} (\mathcal{H}_2^2 - \mathcal{H}_3^2), \quad (4)$$

$$\partial_0 \mathcal{H}_1 = -(1 - q + 2 \Sigma_+) \mathcal{H}_1 + 3 (R_2 \mathcal{H}_3 - R_3 \mathcal{H}_2), \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_0 \mathcal{H}_2 = -(1 - q - \Sigma_+ - \sqrt{3} \Sigma_-) \mathcal{H}_2 + 3 (R_3 \mathcal{H}_1 - R_1 \mathcal{H}_3), \quad (6)$$

$$\partial_0 \mathcal{H}_3 = -(1 - q - \Sigma_+ + \sqrt{3} \Sigma_-) \mathcal{H}_3 + 3 (R_1 \mathcal{H}_2 - R_2 \mathcal{H}_1), \quad (7)$$

where the R_α are determined by the algebraic constraints

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \mathcal{H}_2 + 3 (\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1) R_3 = 0, \quad \mathcal{H}_2 \mathcal{H}_3 + 3 (\Sigma_3 - \Sigma_2) R_1 = 0, \quad \mathcal{H}_3 \mathcal{H}_1 + 3 (\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_3) R_2 = 0, \quad (8)$$

where $\Sigma_1 = -2 \Sigma_+/3$, $\Sigma_2 = (\Sigma_+ + \sqrt{3} \Sigma_-)/3$, $\Sigma_3 = (\Sigma_+ - \sqrt{3} \Sigma_-)/3$. The physical phase space of this dynamical system admits various invariant submanifolds: the most important for the present discussion are the three that arise when the magnetic field is aligned with one of the shear eigendirections. The latter can be Fermi-transported in each of these cases, e.g., $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}_3 = 0$, as it follows from (8) in the non degenerate case. Using the algebraic constraints (2) one sees that now equations (3)–(7) are reduced to a planar system:

$$\partial_0 \Sigma_+ = (2 - \Sigma_+) (1 - \Sigma_+^2 - \Sigma_-^2), \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_0 \Sigma_- = -\Sigma_- (1 - \Sigma_+^2 - \Sigma_-^2), \quad (10)$$

where from (2) one has $1 - \Sigma_+^2 - \Sigma_-^2 \geq 0$. The system above is the heart of the dynamics of the more general case when the magnetic field is not aligned; it has one

isolated stationary point at $\Sigma_+ = 2, \Sigma_- = 0$ (outside the physical phase space), and is also stationary on the whole Kasner ring $\Sigma_+^2 + \Sigma_-^2 = 1$. The eigenvalues of the Jacobian at points on the Kasner ring are $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = -4\Sigma_+ + 2$. The first vanishes because there is no tangential motion along the ring, the second is non-negative, $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, for $\Sigma_+ \leq 1/2$. Thus, one third of the Kasner ring is asymptotically stable, because of the aligned magnetic field. These local properties of the Kasner ring are better understood noticing that the planar system above admits the explicit solutions

$$\Sigma_- = C(\Sigma_+ - 2), \quad -1/\sqrt{3} \leq C \leq 1/\sqrt{3}, \quad (11)$$

which are heteroclinic orbits joining pairs of points on the ring (they are straight lines passing through the point $\Sigma_+ = 2, \Sigma_- = 0$). Since the magnetic field can be aligned with any of the three spatial directions, there are two other stationary points of the system (3)–(7) in the (Σ_+, Σ_-) -plane, located at $\Sigma_+ = -1, \Sigma_- = \pm\sqrt{3}$. Passing through these two points, two other sets of heteroclinic orbits arise. The overall effect of this structure in the physical phase space is that the Kasner ring becomes completely unstable, as each of its points becomes a saddle.

3. Conclusions

The phase space structure in this example is reminiscent of the Bianchi Type–IX dynamics, in that the Kasner ring no longer is a source at any point. Thus, the approach towards the initial singularity becomes more complicated and probably leads to an “oscillatory” regime. Unfortunately, it is harder to obtain a detailed understanding of this initial behaviour in the present situation because of the existence of the constraints (8). We do not want to address the question if this behaviour is chaotic or not. This theme has been debated for a long time in the context of the Bianchi Type–IX models (see the contribution of Di Bari *et al* in this volume). Clearly, further work is needed to clarify the dynamics in the vicinity of the singularity of the Bianchi Type–I models with a magnetic field. In particular, a numerical investigation would be desirable.

The Kasner ring is a source for Bianchi Type–I dust spacetimes with no magnetic field.¹⁵ We have seen that this is no longer the case when magnetic fields are included. Indeed, the important point is that a magnetic field completely changes the structure of the phase space in the vicinity of the initial singularity, and as one gets closer to the singularity this effect becomes more and more relevant. Hence, contrary to some folklore, matter fields can strongly influence the dynamics close to the initial singularity.

Acknowledgements: MB would like to thank ICTP and INFN for financial support, and SISSA for hospitality.

1. S. Matarrese, O. Pantano, and D. Saez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 320 (1994); *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **271**, 513 (1994).

2. S. Matarrese, O. Pantano and D. Saez, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 1311 (1993).
3. M. Bruni, P. K. S. Dunsby, and G. F. R. Ellis, *Astrophys. J.* **395**, 34 (1992).
4. A. Barnes and R. R. Rowlingson, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6**, 949 (1989).
5. W. M. Lesame, P. K. S. Dunsby, and G. F. R. Ellis, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 3406 (1995).
6. E. Bertschinger and B. Jain, *Astrophys. J.* **431**, 486 (1994); E. Bertschinger and A. Hamilton, *Astrophys. J.* **435**, 1 (1994); L. Kofman, and D. Pogosyan, *Astrophys. J.* **442**, 30 (1995).
7. M. Bruni, S. Matarrese and O. Pantano, *Astrophys. J.*, **445**, 958 (1995).
8. M. Bruni, S. Matarrese and O. Pantano, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **74**, 1916 (1995).
9. D. S. Goldwirth and T. Piran, *Phys. Rep.* **214**, 223 (1992).
10. P. Szekeres, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **41**, 55 (1975).
11. M. A. G. Bonilla, M. Mars, J. M. M. Senovilla, C. F. Soperta and R. Vera, to appear in *Phys. Rev. D* (1996).
12. H. van Elst, C. Ugla, W. M. Lesame, G. F. R. Ellis and R. Maartens, preprint gr-qc/9611002.
13. H. Mutoh, T. Hirai, K. Maeda, astro-ph/9608183.
14. M. Bruni, H. van Elst and C. Ugla, in preparation (1996).
15. J. Wainwright and L. Hsu, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6**, 1409 (1989); J. Wainwright, in *Dynamical Systems in Cosmology*, Eds. J. Wainwright and G. F. R. Ellis, (Cambridge University Press, in press).